



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,468	02/07/2001	Brian Bruun	0459-0527P	2451

2292 7590 06/30/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SCHLAK, DANIEL K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/720,468

Applicant(s)

BRUUN ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel K Schlak

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 46-90 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 46-70, drawn to method for sorting.

Group II, claim(s) 71-86, drawn to apparatus for conveying.

Group III, claim(s) 87-90, drawn to apparatus for storage.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because Group I is specific to a sorting operation, with determination of characteristic and allocations based thereupon, while Group II is specific to conveying with no requisite that items have varying destinations (claim 71 is merely a group of conveyors with loading, unloading, and storage), under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of the method, Group I, is the sortation and its nature of a method of sortation. The special technical feature of the apparatus, Group II, is in its ability to allow items to creep forward on their respective conveyors.

The inventions listed as Groups II and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because Group II is specific to a conveyor, while Group III is merely a storage unit, which has none of the technical features of Group II such as conveyors, control system, etc, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of the Group II is orienting traveling items. The special technical feature of the Group III, is in storing articles.

Art Unit: 3653

The inventions listed as Groups I and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because Group I is specific to a sorting operation, with determination of characteristic and allocations based thereupon, while Group III is specific to storing items, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of the method, Group I, is the sortation and its nature of a method of sortation. The special technical feature of the apparatus, Group III, is in its ability to store items.

Applicant has amended claim 71 to incorporate a recitation of at least part of claim 46. Such has not been effective in achieving withdrawal of the restriction requirement, as claim 71 still has no positive recitation of the trays, which are the purported novelty of claim 46. Claim 1 and claim 71 each define over the art in completely different ways. Such as, claim 71 attempts to define over GB 2,224,147 by utilizing method terminology to recite that the items are placed into trays. However, the system of claim 71, like GB 2,224,147, could be used to convey, for example, blocks of would, given that they were properly marked.

Further, the added subject matter to claim 71 was as follows; "control means for controlling the operation.... according to the method of claim 46". However, there are many parts of the method of claim 46 that could never be effected by a control system. Such as, does the control means itself actually physically put the items into trays? Of course not. How can the method of claim 46 be considered fully invoked by claim 71 when there is no mention of an apparatus means for getting the items into the trays? For this, claim 71 is improper as it is not enabled and wholly nonspecific. Thus, the

Art Unit: 3653

special technical feature of claim 71, in light of the prior art, is means for moving articles from one conveyor to another.

For future reference, Applicant is advised in advance that claim 71, if left as it currently appears, will be objected to for failing to further limit a parent claim (as apparatus recitations hardly contribute to a method claim in any substantial way), and further rejected to because the last two lines are so ambiguous it is not possible to establish the boundaries of the claim, such as what it might cover, and what it might not.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel K Schlak whose telephone number is 703-305-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Walsh can be reached on 703-306 - 4173. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-306-4195 for regular communications and 703-306-4195 for After Final communications.


Application/Control Number: 09/720,468

Page 5

Art Unit: 3653

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308 - 1113.

dks
June 26, 2003


DONALD K. WALSH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600